REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12 are currently pending in the application. Claims 13-44 have been withdrawn. Claim 1 has been amended. New claims 45-56 are added herewith. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-identified application, in view of the following remarks.

Addition of New Claims 45-56

With this response, Applicants add new claims 45-56. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that these new claims are allowable over the cited art.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gabber, et al. (US Patent No. 5,961,593) ("Gabber"), in view of Alkhatib (US Patent No. 6,119,171) ("Alkhatib"). Applicants submit independent claim 1, and the claims directly or indirectly dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited references, for at least the reason discussed herein.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

> A method, comprising:
> transmitting a packet from at least one client to a deceiver configured to communicate with a domain name server to resolve the name of a website associated with a destination server corresponding to the packet...
> processing the resolved packet and storing data from the packet in the controller, wherein the controller stores verification data related to client, forwarder and destination server communications...

transmitting a verification request from the forwarder to the controller, wherein the verification data is confirmed before the packet is transmitted to a destination server.

Applicants submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest at least the elements recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicants submit that neither Gabber, nor Alkhatib teach, disclose or suggest a method implementing communications between a client, a deceiver, a controller, a forwarder and a destination server, as recited in amended independent claim 1. The Examiner asserts the cited references, "taken together, clearly provide the client/server transmissions utilizing a deceiver and controller, as broadly claimed." (See, Office Action, page 4, ¶4). Applicants submit that per MPEP § 2111.01, the claims are interpreted broadly, but in light of the specification. More specifically the MPEP states, "claims are not to be read in a vacuum, and limitations therein are to be interpreted in light of the specification in giving them their 'broadest reasonable interpretation'." (Quoting *In re Okuzawa,* 537 F.2d 545, 548) (emphasis in the original). Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the claimed invention in the Office Action, but have amended independent claim 1 to further clarify the elements consistent with the specification and expedite prosecution.

Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed invention. For example, the Examiner states, "Gabber plainly describes routines that process client/server data, p5 3-27 commensurate with the claimed deceiver and controller operations." (See, Office Action, page 5, ¶1). In contrast, Applicants submit that Gabber is silent with regard to the name resolution for clients. The Examiner acknowledges "Gabber does

not explicitly disclose the additional limitations below. Alkhatib teaches a domain name routing server, p8, 15-34..." As such, Applicants submit that Examiner has over-generalized the deceiver, the controller and the forwarder, as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand in light of the specification.

Accordingly, in light of the clarifying amendments, Applicants submit that neither Gabber, nor Alkhatib teach, disclose or suggest a deceiver, a controller and a forwarder, with a verification process as recited in amended independent claim 1. For example, neither reference, taken alone or in combination, discloses, "transmitting a packet from at least one client to a deceiver" and "from the deceiver to a controller configured to communicate with a domain name server" where the forwarder is "transmitting a verification request from the forwarder to the controller, wherein the verification data is confirmed before the packet is transmitted to a, where the packet is then transmitted to a second destination server" as recited in amended independent claim 1.

As prevously argued, Gabber is directed to two embodiments of a method and system for using a proxy server to browse server sites, defined in Gabber as "any site capable of being browsed" anonymously. (See, Gabber et, al, Abstract; Col. 5, lines. 32-34). More specifically, Gabber's first embodiment implements three routines:

> (1) "processes site-specific substitute identifiers constructed from data specific to user 105a";
> (2) "transmits the substitute identifiers to server site 110g" and
> (3) "a third routine removes (and possibly substitutes) portions of the browsing commands that would identify user site 105a to server site 110g." (See, Gabber, et al., Col. 6, lines 1-11).

Gabber's second embodiment implements two routines:

> (1) "constructs a particular substitute identifier from data particular to user site 105a" and
>
> (2) "transmits the particular substitute identifier to central proxy system 110a", which then retransmits the particular substitute identifier to server site 110g. (See, Gabber, et al., Col. 6, lines 26-36).

In both embodiments, Gabber simply discusses accepting a user request at user site 105a, creating substitute identifiers, transmitting the substitute identifiers to the proxy server 110a and relaying the request to a server site 110g.

However, Gabber does not disclose, teach or suggest at least the deceiver, controller and forwarder with a verification process as recited in amended independent claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants submit that Alkhatib does not remedy the deficiencies identified in Gabber with regard to amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that implementing the packet processing by the deceiver, the controller and the forwarder as claimed is patentably distinct from Gabber's transmission of substitute identifier information and Alkhatib's Domain Name Router, taken either alone or in combination.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner's statement -- "It would have been obvious to combine Alkhatib's teachings with Gabber's system for anonymous browsing because the domain name routing system would facilitate the client-server 'course' of communications." -- was made in the benefit of reviewing the claim language. (See, Office Action, page 3, ¶10). Accordingly, a rejection based on hindsight (i.e., using the patent claim as an instruction book) to combine or reconstruct the prior art to arrive at the present invention is impermissible and improper.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references. Also, for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2-12, which are directly or indirectly dependent on independent claim 1, are also patentably distinct from the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal on this ground of rejections.

Applicants further submit that new claims 45-56 are also patentably distinct from the cited references on at least the grounds stated above for independent claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is now believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. In view of these remarks, an early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: July 12, 2005

By: Tony V. Pezzano
Tony V. Pezzano
Registration No. 38,271

Correspondence Address:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, NY 10281
(212) 415-8700 (telephone)
(212) 415-8701 (facsimile)